

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 395, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

FOCUS ON NO
"YES" OR "MAYBE" WILL BE ADDRESSED
IN REPORT ...

INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST

(Article IV - City CEQA Guidelines)

LEAD CITY AGENCY City of Los Angeles Planning Department	COUNCIL DISTRICT 15	DATE 3/14/96
---	------------------------	-----------------

PROJECT TITLE/NO. Harbor Gateway Center	CASE NO.
--	----------

PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.	<input type="checkbox"/> DOES have significant changes from previous actions. <input type="checkbox"/> DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.
---------------------------	--


PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of the development of a retail "power center" and an office/ industrial park on a 153-acre site currently occupied by industrial warehouse buildings. The first phase of the project consists of the construction of 450,000 square feet of commercial development and 2,400 parking spaces on the northern end of the site. The 450,000 square feet of retail space will include 30,000 square feet of restaurants and a theater with up to 4,000 seats. The second and third phases include the construction of an estimated 1.65 million square feet and 900,000 square feet, respectively, of industrial park space. The project includes construction of internal access roads. Required permits include a vesting tentative tract map, conditional use permits (CUP) for restaurant uses, a development agreement, and a variance or other entitlement for parking.

PROJECT LOCATION

South side of 190th Street, between Western and Normandie Avenues

PLANNING DISTRICT Harbor Gateway	STATUS: <input type="checkbox"/> PRELIMINARY <input type="checkbox"/> PROPOSED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADOPTED date 7/3/85
---	---

EXISTING ZONING M3-1	MAX. DENSITY ZONING 1.5:1	PROJECT DENSITY 0.5:1
PLANNED LAND USE & ZONE Heavy Industrial (M3, P)	MAX. DENSITY PLAN 1.5:1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DOES CONFORM TO PLAN <input type="checkbox"/> DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN <input type="checkbox"/> NO DISTRICT PLAN
PLAN DENSITY RANGE	PROJECT DENSITY 0.5:1	

 **DETERMINATION** (to be completed by Lead City Agency)

On the basis of the attached initial study checklist and evaluation:

NEGATIVE DECLARATION	<input type="checkbox"/> I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION	<input type="checkbox"/> I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED. (See attached condition(s).)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	<input type="checkbox"/> I find the proposed MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

SIGNATURE	TITLE
-----------	-------

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by Lead City Agency)

BACKGROUND

PROPOSER NAME McDonnell Douglas Realty Company	PHONE
PROPOSER ADDRESS 4060 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90808	
AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST City of Los Angeles Planning Department	DATE SUBMITTED
PROPOSAL NAME (If applicable) Harbor Gateway Center	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

(Explanation of all "yes" and maybe" answers are required to be attached on separate sheets.)

	YES	MAYBE	NO
1. EARTH. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?			X
b. Disruptions, displacement, compaction or overcovering of the soil?	X		
c. Change in topography of ground surface relief features?			X
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?			X
e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?		X	
f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?			X
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic, hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?			X
2. AIR. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?		X	
b. The creation of objectionable odors?			X
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?			X
d. Expose the project residents to severe air pollution conditions?			X
3. WATER. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?			X
b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amounts of surface water runoff?		X	
c. Alterations to the course of flow of flood waters?		X	
d. Change in the amount surface water in any water body?			X
e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?		X	
f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?			X
g. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through intersection of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?			X
h. Reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies			X
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?			X
j. Changes in the temperature flow, or chemical content of surface thermal springs.			X
4. PLANT LIFE. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops and aquatic plants)?			X
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?			X
c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or is a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?			X
d. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?			X

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

	YES	MAYBE	NO
5. ANIMAL LIFE. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Change in diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)?			X
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?			X
c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?			X
d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?			X
6. NOISE. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increases in existing noise levels?		X	
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		X	
7. LIGHT AND GLARE. Will the proposal			
a. Produce new light or glare from street lights or other sources?	X		
b. Reduce access to sunlight of adjacent properties due to shade and shadow			X
8. LAND USE. Will the proposal result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	X		
9. NATURAL RESOURCES. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?			X
b. Depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?			X
10. RISK OF UPSET. Will the proposal involve:			
a. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?			X
b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.			X
11. POPULATION. Will the proposal result in:			
a. The relocation of any persons because of the effects upon housing, commercial or industrial facilities?			X
b. Change in the distribution, density or growth rate of human population of an area?			X
12. HOUSING. Will the proposal:			
a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?			X
b. Have an impact on the available rental housing in the community?			X
c. Result in demolition, relocation or remodeling of residential, commercial, or industrial buildings or other facilities?	X		
13. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Generation of additional vehicular movement?	X		
b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	X		
c. Impact upon existing transportation system?		X	
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?		X	
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?			X
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?		X	
14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:			
a. Fire Protection?		X	
b. Police Protection?		X	
c. Schools?			X
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?			X
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?		X	
f. Other governmental services?			X
15. ENERGY. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Use of exceptional amounts of fuel energy?			X
b. Increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?			X

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Form Gen 159 - Page 4

	YES	MAYBE	NO
16. ENERGY. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Use of exceptional amounts of fuel or energy?	_____	_____	X
b. Significant increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	_____	_____	X
17. UTILITIES. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or alterations to the following utilities:			
a. Power natural gas?	_____	X	_____
b. Communications systems?	_____	X	_____
c. Water?	_____	X	_____
d. Sewer or septic tanks?	_____	X	_____
e. Storm water drainage?	_____	X	_____
f. Solid waste and disposal?	_____	X	_____
18. HUMAN HEALTH. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?	_____	X	_____
b. Exposure of people to potential hazards?	_____	X	_____
19. AESTHETICS. Will the proposed project result in:			
a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public?	_____	_____	X
b. The creation of any aesthetically offensive site open to the public?	_____	_____	X
c. The destruction of a stand of trees, a rock outcropping or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature?	_____	_____	X
d. Any negative aesthetic effect?	_____	X	_____
20. RECREATION. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality of quantity of existing recreational opportunities?	_____	_____	X
21. CULTURAL RESOURCES:			
a. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?	_____	_____	_____
b. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?	_____	_____	_____
c. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	_____	_____	_____
d. Will the prospect restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	_____	_____	_____
22. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.			
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the en- vironment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or elimi- nate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	_____	X	_____
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the dis- advantage of long-term, environmental goals.	_____	X	_____
c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?	_____	X	_____
d. Does the project have environmental effects which cause sub- stantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	_____	X	_____

"Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

(Attach additional
sheets if necessary)

See attached

PREPARED BY	TITLE	TELEPHONE	DATE
-------------	-------	-----------	------

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

ATTACHMENT B ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

This section responds to each of the questions listed in the Environmental Impacts Analysis section of the City of Los Angeles Initial Study and Checklist. Each response provides a preliminary evaluation of the environmental consequences of implementing the Harbor Gateway Center project. Supporting information and/or data have been provided where appropriate. In general, issues for which the response is "Yes" or "Maybe" are recommended to be addressed in the Harbor Gateway Center Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

1. Earth. Will the proposal result in:

a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes in geologic substructures?

No. Project construction would require conventional excavation and fill operations. No unstable earth conditions are known to exist on the site. The project site is not within any Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone or Fault Rupture Study Area, nor is it in an area with high susceptibility to liquefaction.¹ Assuming the use of standard construction practices, no changes to geologic substructures are anticipated.

b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil?

Yes. The project site is flat and the proposed project does not include any subterranean structures. Nevertheless, some earth movement, excavation, and building pad construction would be required prior to construction. Further analysis of this issue is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR. Appropriate mitigation will be developed to address any identified significant impacts during the EIR process.

c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?

No. The project site is flat, with very little ground surface relief. Though construction would require some minor earth movement, the topography of the site would not change

¹ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, *Proposed City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework GIS Maps*, 1995.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Attachment B -- Environmental Evaluation

substantially. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

d. The destruction, covering, or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?

No. The project site is flat and contains no unique geologic or physical features. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?

Maybe. Temporary soil erosion may occur during project construction. Because the site is flat, erosion is not expected to be substantial. Nevertheless, further analysis of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR. Appropriate erosion control practices will be identified as part of the EIR process. [NEED TO CONFIRM AFTER RECEIVING GRADING INFO]

f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel or a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet or lake?

No. There are no streams, rivers, lakes or major drainage channels on the project site. The site is over five miles from the nearest beach. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures are necessary.

g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

No. Though the project site is subject to the seismic hazards that exist throughout Southern California, it is not in any Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone or Fault Rupture Study Area.² Compliance with the most recent Uniform Building Code requirements would reduce impacts related to geologic hazards to a less than significant level. No further analysis or mitigation is necessary.

² *City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Proposed City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework GIS Maps, 1995.*

2. Air. Will the proposal result in:

a. Air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?

Maybe. The Los Angeles metropolitan area is characterized by relatively poor air quality. State and Federal air quality standards are often exceeded in the air basin. Implementation of proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would contribute to the local emissions inventory, during both construction and normal project operations. Additional analysis of this issue is recommended to assess the project's emissions profile relative to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds as part of the EIR.

b. The creation of objectionable odors?

No. Neither project-related construction activity nor operation of the proposed retail and office/industrial park project is expected to create objectionable odors. No additional analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

c. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

No. Implementation of the proposed project would not alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, either locally or regionally. The proposed floor-to-area ratio (FAR) for the entire site is approximately 0.5. At the proposed density, building spacing would be such that no wind jetting would be expected to occur. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

d. Expose the project residents to severe air pollution conditions?

No. There are currently no residents on the project site and no residential units are proposed as part of proposed Harbor Gateway Center project. Therefore, no exposure of project residents to severe air pollution conditions would occur. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Attachment B -- Environmental Evaluation

3. Water. Will the proposal result in:

- a. **Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?**

No. There are no natural watercourses in the vicinity of the project site and the Pacific Ocean is over five miles away. Consequently, project implementation would not affect the course or direction of water movements. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

- b. **Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amounts of surface water runoff?**

Maybe. The project site is currently almost entirely covered with impervious surfaces such as buildings and pavement. The proposed project would not be expected to increase overall surface runoff from the site but may alter drainage patterns on and around the site. An analysis of the project's impact upon local drainage patterns is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR. Appropriate mitigation measures for any identified impacts will also be developed during the EIR preparation.

- c. **Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?**

Maybe. As discussed in Item 3.b above, the proposed project would not be expected to increase overall surface runoff from the site. In addition, because the site is outside the 100- and 500-year flood plains, no significant flooding of the site is anticipated.³ Nevertheless, project implementation may alter drainage patterns on and around the site, potentially contributing to localized flooding effects. An analysis of the project's impact upon local drainage patterns is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR. Appropriate mitigation measures for any identified impacts will also be developed during the EIR preparation.

- d. **Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?**

No. The project site contains no surface water bodies, nor are any present in the site vicinity. Therefore, no impact to surface water quantity is anticipated. No further assessment of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

³ *City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Proposed City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework GIS Maps, 1995.*

- e. **Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including, but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?**

Maybe. As discussed in Item 1.e, construction activity may temporarily increase soil erosion on-site. Increased erosion could cause an increase the turbidity of runoff from the site. Because the site is flat, erosion would not be expected to be substantial. Nevertheless, further evaluation of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR. Appropriate erosion control practices will be identified during the EIR process.

- f. **Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?**

No. The groundwater level is approximately 70 feet below ground surface in this area. No excavations to this depth are proposed as part of the project. No aquifers would be affected by project development. Further analysis of this issue is not recommended and no mitigation would be required.

- g. **Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?**

No. No direct groundwater extraction is proposed as part of the project. Because only minimal excavation would be required prior to project construction, no aquifer is anticipated to be affected by grading activity. No further analysis of this issue is recommended.

- h. **Reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?**

No. There are no major public water supplies such as reservoirs or aqueducts in the project vicinity, nor is there currently any known extraction of ground water from any aquifers that underlie the site or the immediate site vicinity. Thus, project implementation would not alter any major water sources or significantly reduce the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Attachment B -- Environmental Evaluation

i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?

No. Because the project site is over 5 miles from the Pacific Ocean, it is not subject to tidal wave hazards. The site is not within any 100- or 500-year flood plain.⁴ Therefore, on-site flood hazards are not considered significant. No further analysis of this issue is recommended, although the project's potential to affect local drainage patterns is recommended to be evaluated in the EIR (see Item 3.b above).

j. Changes in the temperature, flow, or chemical content of surface thermal springs.

No. There are no known thermal springs in the project vicinity. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be required.

4. Plant Life. Will the proposal result in:

a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops and aquatic plants)?

No. The project site is presently fully developed and located in a highly urbanized area devoid of natural biotic habitats. On-site vegetation is limited to introduced ornamental landscaping (e.g., alder, olive, eucalyptus, juniper, ground cover, etc.). Therefore, project implementation would not change the diversity or number of any plant species. No further analysis of this issue area is necessary and no mitigation would be required.

b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?

No. As on-site vegetation is limited to introduced ornamental landscaping, project implementation would not affect any unique, rare, or endangered plant species. No further analysis of this issue area is necessary and no mitigation would be required.

⁴ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, *Proposed City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework GIS Maps*, 1995.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Attachment B -- Environmental Evaluation

- c. **Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or as a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?**

No. The proposed project would likely increase on-site landscaping but would not introduce new species of plants or serve as a barrier to the replenishment of existing species. No further analysis of this issue area is necessary and no mitigation would be required.

- d. **Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?**

No. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and does not contain any agricultural crops. No further analysis of this issue area is necessary and no mitigation would be required.

5. **Animal Life.** Will the proposal result in:

- a. **Change in diversity of species, or number of any species of animal (birds, land animals, including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms or insects)?**

No. The project site is in a highly urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles that is devoid of native animal species. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect the diversity of number of any animal species. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

- b. **Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?**

No. As mentioned in Item 5.a above, the project site is not inhabited by native animal species. Consequently, project implementation would not affect any unique, rare, or endangered species. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

- c. **Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?**

No. The project site is in a highly urbanized area that is not a migration corridor for any animal species. The proposed project would not introduce any new species of animals into the area. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

d. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?

No. The project site is in a highly urbanized area devoid of native animal species. No water courses or bodies of water are in the site vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause or contribute to the deterioration of any fish or wildlife habitat. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

6. Noise. Will the proposal result in:

a. Increases in existing noise levels?

Maybe. Project-related construction activity may generate temporary increases in noise levels on and near the project site. Following construction, the increase in motor vehicle traffic to and from the site may increase noise levels both on-site and along adjacent roadways, including 190th Street, Western Avenue, and Normandie Avenue. Additional analysis to examine potential noise impacts related to both temporary construction activity and long-term operation of the proposed project is recommended to be included in the EIR. Mitigation measures will be developed to minimize any identified significant noise impacts to the degree feasible.

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Maybe. During project construction, some adjacent residential uses could be exposed to noise levels which temporarily exceed City of Los Angeles noise standards. In addition, noise generated at the adjacent Capitol Metals Company is presently audible on parts of the project site and may cause noise annoyance to future on-site employees and patrons. Additional analysis to assess the magnitude of potential construction-related noise levels at adjacent land uses and suggest feasible measures to mitigate any identified significant impacts is recommended to be included in the EIR. In addition, the effects of existing noise levels on-site on future employees and patrons is recommended to be evaluated in the EIR.

7. Light. Will the proposal:

a. Produce new light or glare from street lights or other sources?

Yes. Implementation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would increase the number of light sources on-site by adding illuminated building signage, security lighting,

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

and parking lot lighting. Further analysis of light and glare issues is recommended as part of the EIR.

b. Reduce access to sunlight of adjacent properties due to shade and shadow?

No. Phase 1 of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would include buildings up to 44 feet in height. The heights of buildings to be constructed in Phases 2 and 3 of the project have not been determined. The increased in building massing would have the potential to increase shading effects on and around the project site. However, the only shadow-sensitive uses in the vicinity of the site are residences at the southern edge of the site, which would not be shaded by project structures. The only adjacent uses with the potential to be shaded are road and railroad rights-of-way, and commercial/industrial uses to the north, west, and east. As these uses are not shadow-sensitive, no significant shadow impacts are anticipated. Therefore, no further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

8. Land Use. Will the proposal result in an alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

Yes. The project site is currently occupied by warehouse buildings previously used for aircraft parts manufacturing. The proposed project would involve the demolition of all structures on-site and construction of a retail power center and office and industrial park uses. Further analysis of the project's conformance with City of Los Angeles land use designations and zoning regulations, including any required permits and approvals, as well as the project's compatibility with adjacent residential land uses, is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR. Appropriate measures will be developed to mitigate any identified significant land use impacts.

9. Natural Resources. Will the proposal result in:

a. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?

No. Construction and operation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would consume natural resources such as building materials and fossil fuels. However, the project's use of natural resources would be consistent with a normal rate of urban growth and would represent only a minute fraction of the cumulative amounts of such natural resources consumed in the Southern California region. The project would conform to all applicable regulations

regarding energy conservation, and reuse and recycling of raw materials, and therefore would not consume resources in a wasteful manner. Further analysis of this issue is not recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

b. Depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?

No. Construction and operation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would consume non-renewable resources such as building materials and fossil fuels. However, the project's use of non-renewable resources would be consistent with a normal rate of urban growth and would represent only a minute fraction of the cumulative consumption of such natural resources in the Southern California region and would not significantly contribute to the depletion of such resources. The project would conform to all applicable regulations regarding energy conservation, and reuse and recycling of raw materials, and therefore would not consume resources in a wasteful manner. Further analysis of this issue is not recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

10. Risk of Upset. Will the proposal involve:

a. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation?) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?

No. The retail and office/light industrial uses proposed as part of the Harbor Gateway Center project would not involve the use of large quantities of hazardous substances. As compared to the previous heavy industrial use of the site, the potential for explosions or release of hazardous substances would be reduced and would represent an overall improvement in conditions with respect to this issue. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation beyond existing regulations around the handling and disposal of hazardous materials would be necessary.

b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.

No. Project implementation would not result in the closure of any street designated as an evacuation route in any adopted emergency response plan. Any physical changes to streets in the area would be improvements designed to accommodate project-generated traffic. Internal

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

access on the site will be provided to City of Los Angeles Fire Department standards. No further evaluation of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

11. Population. Will the proposal result in:

- a. The relocation of any persons because of the effects upon housing, commercial or industrial facilities?**

No. There are no residences on the project site and none are proposed as part of the Harbor Gateway Center project. As the project would replace an industrial use with a commercial use that is more compatible with adjacent residential properties, relocation of residents in the area would not be required. There are currently about 380 McDonnell Douglas employees working on the site, all of whom would eventually be relocated as ongoing operations on the site phase out or relocate. In addition, full buildout and occupancy of the proposed project would add an estimated 4,400 to 6,100 jobs on the project site. Further analysis of this issue is not recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

- b. Change in the distribution, density or growth rate of human population of an area?**

No. There are no residential properties on the project site and none are planned as part of the proposed project. Therefore, no direct effects to any existing residential populations would occur. Full buildout and occupancy of the project would add between 4,400 and 6,100 jobs on the project site. The new employment opportunities may be filled, in part, by people relocating to be near their jobs. Thus, the project may have the potential to incrementally contribute to population growth in the subregion. However, on-site jobs are anticipated to be filled primarily by current residents. In addition, the increase in employment on the site represents only a small fraction of the 186,000 jobs projected to be created in the South Bay Cities subregion between 1990 and 2010 by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in its Regional Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the increase in daytime population resulting from project implementation would not be expected to result in a significant change in the density or growth rate of local human populations. Additional evaluation of this issue is not recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

12. Housing. Will the proposal:

a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

No. There are no residential units on the project site and none are proposed as part of the Harbor Gateway Center project. The increase in on-site employment on the project site may incrementally increase demand for housing in the area as some new employees relocate to be near their jobs. However, as discussed in Item 11.b above, most on-site jobs are expected to be filled by current area residents while the additional employment opportunities on-site would represent only a small fraction of project employment growth in the South Bay Cities region. Consequently, the increase in demand for housing associated with the project is not expected to be significant. Further analysis of this issue is not recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

b. Have an impact on the available rental housing in the community?

No. No rental housing units would be directly affected by the project. The increase in on-site employment on the project site may incrementally increase demand for rental housing in the area as some new employees relocate to be near their jobs. However, as discussed in Item 11.b and 12.a, most on-site jobs are expected to be filled by current area residents while the additional employment opportunities on-site would represent only a small fraction of project employment growth in the South Bay Cities region. Therefore, no significant change in rental housing occupancy rates in the area is anticipated. Further analysis of this issue is not recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

c. Result in demolition, relocation or remodeling of residential, commercial, or industrial buildings or other facilities?

Yes. Implementation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would entail the demolition of all on-site industrial and office structures. However, all existing structures on-site have either been vacated or are planned to be vacated in the future. No residential structures would be affected. No additional analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be required.

13. Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:

a. Generation of additional vehicular movement?

Yes. The project would generate vehicular movement during both project construction and operation of the site subsequent to construction. Existing roadways that could be affected by the additional vehicular movement include 190th Street, Western Avenue, Normandie Avenue, the San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405), and the Harbor Freeway (Interstate 110). Further analysis of the effect of vehicular trips generated by the project is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR.

b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

Yes. The proposed project would not affect existing public parking facilities. However, the proposed retail and office/industrial park uses would generate demand for parking on-site. Further analysis of parking requirements is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR for the proposed project.

c. Impact upon existing transportation system?

Maybe. As discussed in Item 13.a above, the proposed project would generate additional traffic on several roadways in the area, during both the construction and operational phases. This additional traffic would have the potential to adversely affect the existing transportation system in the area. Further analysis of this issue is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR.

d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?

Maybe. As discussed in Item 13.a above, the proposed project would generate additional traffic on several roads in the area, during both the construction and operational phases. This additional traffic would have the potential to alter circulation patterns in the area. Further analysis of this issue is recommended to be conducted as part of the EIR.

e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?

No. Implementation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would not generate any significant waterborne, rail, or air traffic. The project site is, however, located along two rail lines. A Southern Pacific rail line that carries an average of about 2 trains per day runs

in a north-south direction along the project site's eastern edge, while a Santa Fe rail line that carries an average of 4 to 6 trains per day runs east-west along the site's southern boundary. An active rail spur from the Santa Fe line serves the adjacent Capitol Metals Company. Project implementation would not directly affect rail operations on either of the main rail lines. Valid easements will be honored under the project. Therefore, no adverse impacts to rail services are anticipated. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?

Maybe. The increase in motor vehicle traffic to and from the project site would have the potential to create additional traffic hazards on area roads. Safety issues related to transportation are recommended to be further analyzed as part of the EIR. If any significant safety issues are identified, appropriate feasible mitigation measures will be recommended.

14. Public Services. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

a. Fire Protection?

Maybe. The City of Los Angeles Fire Department provides fire protection services to the Harbor Gateway Center site. The addition of buildings, employees, and retail patrons on the site may create the need for additional fire protection and emergency medical services. Further analysis of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR for the proposed project.

b. Police Protection?

Maybe. The City of Los Angeles Police Department provides police protection service to the project site. The increase in on-site employment and addition of retail uses on-site may create the need for additional police officers or facilities in the area. Further analysis of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR.

c. Schools?

No. The project does not propose any residential units. Therefore, project buildout would not create a direct need for additional classroom space at any school districts that serve the project area. Although full project buildout and occupancy would create between 4,400 and 6,100 new jobs on the project site, this number is comparable to the 5,000 employees that

previously worked at the McDonnell Douglas facility. In addition, most on-site employees are expected to come from the local work force. Thus, no significant additional demand for school facilities in the project vicinity or further afield would be expected as a result of project implementation. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

d. Parks or other recreational facilities?

No. The proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would not directly affect any parks or other recreational facilities, nor does the proposed project include any residential or other uses that typically generate demand for recreational facilities. Consequently, no impact to parks is anticipated. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Maybe. Certain improvements to local infrastructure, including the dedication of new roadways to the City, may be required in conjunction with project buildout. Further analysis of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR.

f. Other governmental services?

No. Implementation of the Harbor Gateway Center project would not substantively affect any other governmental services not otherwise explicitly addressed in this checklist. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

15,16. Energy. Will the proposal result in:

a. Use of exceptional amounts of fuel or energy?

No. Construction and operation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would require the use of natural gas and electricity, while vehicular fuel would be consumed by employees and patrons travelling to and from the site. However, energy consumption associated with the proposed project would be consistent with normal levels of urban activity and would represent only a minute fraction of overall energy consumption in the region. In addition, all on-site development would be in accordance with applicable regulations regarding energy conservation set forth in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, thus reduce on-site

energy consumption to the degree feasible. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

b. Increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

No. As discussed in Item 15.a above, construction and operation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would require the use of natural gas and electricity, while vehicular fuel would be consumed by employees and patrons travelling to and from the site. However, energy consumption associated with the proposed project would be consistent with normal levels of urban activity and would represent only a minute fraction of overall energy consumption in the region. The project would not require the development of new energy sources. No further analysis of this issue is recommended and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

17. Utilities. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas?

Maybe. Implementation of the proposed Harbor Gateway Center project would create additional demand for electricity and natural gas on the project site. This demand would be a virtually imperceptible fraction of the electrical power and natural gas demand for the Southern California region. Nevertheless, the relatively large amounts of electricity and natural gas that the proposed project may require alterations to local electricity and natural gas conveyance infrastructure. Further analysis of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR.

b. Communications systems?

Maybe. The proposed project would be expected to increase demands on the local communications system. Although the demand for communication would be small in proportion to regional demand, upgrades to the local communications infrastructure could be needed. Further analysis of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR.

c. Water?

Maybe. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) is responsible for supplying water to all properties in the City of Los Angeles, including the project site. Project implementation would be expected to increase on-site demand for water to support both the project components and landscaped areas. Though this increase in demand would not be expected to adversely affect regional water supplies, expansion of the local distribution network may be necessary to accommodate the incremental increase in demand created by the project. Further analysis of this issue is recommended as part of the EIR.

d. Sewer or septic tanks?

Maybe. Wastewater treatment (sewer) service to the project site is provided by the City of Los Angeles. Although local wastewater infrastructure is in place in the highly urbanized area, the change from industrial to retail and office/industrial park uses may generate additional wastewater flows. The ability of existing local conveyance infrastructure to accommodate projected flows from the site is recommended to be evaluated as part of the EIR.

e. Storm water drainage?

Maybe. Nearly the entire project site is currently covered with impervious surfaces such as buildings and pavement. The proposed commercial retail and office/industrial park uses would not be expected to increase overall storm water runoff from the site. Nevertheless, the reconfiguration of on-site uses may alter drainage patterns on and around the site. The effect of the proposed land use changes is recommended to be further evaluated in the EIR. Any required improvements to local drainage infrastructure will be identified and included as project mitigation.

f. Solid waste and disposal?

Maybe. Existing landfills that are available to the City of Los Angeles are currently near capacity, although potential landfill expansion capacities could accommodate additional growth projected in the City of Los Angeles.⁵ Construction and operation of the proposed project may increase solid waste generation on the project site. Although this increase would represent only a minute fraction of the solid waste generated in the region, it would incrementally contribute to the cumulative effects upon area landfills. This issue is

⁵ *City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework EIR, January 1995.*

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

recommended to be further evaluated as part of the EIR. Appropriate measures to minimize the volume of waste generated on-site will be identified as part of the EIR process.

18. Human Health. Will the proposal result in:

a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?

Maybe. The project site has been used for the manufacture of aircraft since the 1930s. Industrial processes such as aircraft manufacturing generally involve the use of various chemicals with the potential, if spilled, to contaminate soil or groundwater. Some underground storage tanks are located on the site. The site is also located adjacent to the Montrose Chemical site (a Superfund site). Although remediation of any identified contamination would be required prior to any new construction on-site, the potential exposure to health hazards is recommended to be evaluated in the EIR. Mitigation may include further analysis and, if necessary, remediation of any on-site contamination.

b. Exposure of people to potential hazards?

Maybe. See item 18.a above.

19. Aesthetics. Will the proposed project result in:

a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public?

No. The project site is in a heavily urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. There are no scenic vistas or significant public views in the vicinity of the site. No further analysis of these issues is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

b. The creation of any aesthetically offensive site open to the public?

No. The proposed project would replace deteriorating industrial buildings with new retail and industrial/office park development, including planned landscaping. In general, this change would have beneficial aesthetic effects and would be consistent with the ongoing redevelopment of the 190th Street corridor. No further analysis of these issues is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

- c. **The destruction of a stand of trees, a rock outcropping or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature?**

No. The project site is in a heavily urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. There are no significant aesthetic natural features on or in the vicinity of the site. No further analysis of these issues is recommended and no mitigation would be required.

- d. **Any negative aesthetic effect?**

Maybe. The proposed project would generally be expected to improve the aesthetic condition of the project site by replacing aging industrial facilities with attractive, new commercial retail and industrial/office park development and landscaping. Nevertheless, certain elements of the new development (the addition of on-site signage, for example) could be considered to have negative effects on the aesthetic quality of the site. This issue will be further evaluated as part of the EIR. Appropriate mitigation is recommended to be developed to address any identified negative effects.

20. **Recreation. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?**

No. The proposed project would not affect recreational opportunities in the area. Please refer to Response No. 14.d above.

21. **Cultural Resources. Will the proposal result in:**

- a. **The alteration or destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?**
- b. **Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?**
- c. **Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?**
- d. **Will the project restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?**

TBD - LITERATURE SEARCH REGARDING POTENTIAL CULTURAL RESOURCES CURRENTLY BEING CONDUCTED

22. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Maybe. The proposed project would not affect any plant or animal communities (see Items 4 and 5). It would, however, have the potential to affect the quality of the local environment by increasing traffic and traffic-related air emissions and noise (see Items 2, 6, and 13). These issues are recommended to be evaluated as part of the EIR.

- b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.

Maybe. The proposed project would generally be consistent with the ongoing redevelopment of the site vicinity and would therefore help implement the City's long-term goals for the area. Nevertheless, the increased consumption of non-renewable fossil fuels and other raw materials that would occur with project implementation may be considered to incrementally contribute to long-term adverse effects to regional sustainability. These issues are recommended to be evaluated as part of the EIR.

- c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

Maybe. The proposed project would generate additional traffic, air emissions, noise, and other impacts that are individually limited, but may be cumulatively considerable. These issues are recommended to be evaluated as part of the EIR.

- d. Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Maybe. Construction and operation of the project would generate additional motor vehicle traffic, air emissions, and noise, and may affect contaminated soil or groundwater if contamination is found to exist on-site. Such impacts may directly or indirectly cause adverse effects on human beings. These issues are recommended to be evaluated as part of the EIR.